



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/604,428	06/27/2000	Michelle Baker	BAK-007	4879

7590 07/09/2003
David P Gordon Esq
65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/604,428

Applicant(s)

BAKER, MICHELLE

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71, as being so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search of the prior art by the examiner. For example, the following items are not understood: serial number : ---/----,----- filed ----,2000 [BAK-006].
Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Marcus [6,230,118 B1] in view of Kumomura [5,850,219].

5. As per claim 1, Marcus discloses an electronic mail client, comprising:
- a) a mail handling component for sending and receiving electronic mail [processing system 20, col 27-45]; and
 - b) an authoring/reading component for creating electronic mail messages and for reading electronic mail messages, said authoring/reading component having at least two modes of authoring [col 4 lines 6-18], said modes being selectable by said authoring/reading component when creating an electronic mail message [create email message, col 4 lines 32-52]

However Marcus did not detail each mode causes the electronic mail message to be displayed in a different manner when read by the authoring/reading component.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the Marcus 's apparatus by taking the advantages of prior art. It was wellknown in the prior art that an electronic mail system could display messages in a different manner [different ways, different formats, Holleran col 7 lines 25-44; different manners, Kumomura col 6 lines 5-16, col 7 line 44-67, col 8 lines 18-26,col 9 lines 5-12]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of display electronic mail in a different manner as taught by Kumomura into Marcus system in order to utilize the two selectable modes. Doing so would provide a simple, quick and efficient method to process email on network.

6. Claim 8 contains the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

7. As per claims 2,9 Marcus-Kumomura disclose said two modes are selected from the group consisting of customer and vendor, teacher and student, auctioneer and bidder, and doctor and patient [displaying a list of all records, Marcus col 7 lines 21-50].

8. As per claims 3,10 Marcus-Kumomura disclose the mode of a message is encoded in the message and determined by the authoring/reading component when the message is created as inherent feature of proxy email address [Marcus col 5 lines 42-58, col 6 lines 3-15].

9. As per claim 4, Marcus-Kumomura disclose the mode of a message is encoded as a MIME-type as inherent feature of Internet email system.

10. As per claims 5,11 Marcus-Kumomura disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient-of the message to use a first set of tools to respond to the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to use a second set of tools to respond to the message, said first set of tools and said second set of tools being different from each other [Kumomura col 6 lines 5-16, col 7 line 44-67, col 8 lines 18-26,col 9 lines 5-12].

11. As per claims 6,12 Marcus-Kumomura disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see all of the information contained in the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see a only subset of the information contained in the message [Kumomura col 6 lines 5-16, col 7 line 44-67, col 8 lines 18-26,col 9 lines 5-12].

12. As per claims 7,13 Marcus-Kumomura disclose a message created in a first of said two modes allows a recipient of the message to see the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and a message created in a second of said two modes prevents a recipient of the message from seeing the information contained in the message organized in the same way it appeared during creation of the message, and only allows the recipient to see the information organized in a different way [Kumomura col 6 lines 5-16, col 7 line 44-67, col 8 lines 18-26,col 9 lines 5-12].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 14-18,22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Marcus [6,230,148 B1] in view of Kato [5,809,512]

As per claim 14, Marcus discloses an electronic mail client; a) a plurality of authoring/reading components for creating and viewing representation of information [create email message, Marcus col 4 lines 32-52];

However Marcus did not detail b) encoding means for automatically encoding representations created with said authoring/reading components into an Internet-

Art Unit: 2142

compatible email message; and d) decoding means for automatically decoding said representations encoded by said encoding means, wherein at least one of said authoring/reading component is responsive to a role mode encoded in an email message whereby said role mode determines how information in said email message will be displayed.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the Marcus 's apparatus by taking the advantages of prior art. It was wellknown in the prior art that an electronic mail system could automatically encode/decode an electronic message by MIME tools [Eryq, MIME tools reference, pp1-12].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of automatically encode/decode electronic message as taught by Eryq into Marcus system in order to utilize the two selectable modes. Doing so would provide a security and efficient process for using email on network.

14. Claim 22 contains the similar limitations set forth of method claim 14. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 14.

15. Claims 15-18 contain the similar limitations set forth of claims 2,5-7 respectively. Therefore, claims 15-18 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 2,5-7.

16. As per claim 23, Marcus-Eryq disclose the role mode is selected from the group consisting of customer and vendor, teacher and student, auctioneer and bidder, and doctor and patient.

17. As per claim 24, Marcus-Eryq disclose the role mode of a message is encoded as a MIME-type [Eryq, MIME tools reference, pp1-12].
18. As per claim 25, Marcus-Eryq disclose the role mode determines what tools may be used by the email client to view the representation of information [Eryq, MIME tools reference, pp1-12].
19. As per claim 26, Marcus-Eryq disclose the role mode determines what tools may be used by the email client to respond to the message [obtaining a selection and displaying all records, Marcus col 7 lines 20-50].
20. As per claim 27, Marcus-Eryq disclose the role mode determines how much of the representation of information can be viewed by the email client [obtaining a selection and displaying a set of responses, Marcus col 7 lines 20-50].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Marcus [6,230,118 B1] in view of Ji et al [Ji 5,889,943]
22. As per claim 19, Marcus discloses a) a main email component for sending and receiving messages [processing system 20, col 27-45]; and b) a plurality of installable

authoring/reading components for creating and reading messages [create email message, Marcus col 4 lines 32-52],

However Marcus did not detail said main email component communicates with said authoring/reading components through a bidirectional application programming interface.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the Marcus 's apparatus by taking the advantages of prior art. It was wellknown in the prior art that an electronic mail system could provides a bidirectional communication line between client and server [Ji, Fig 5A-B, col 7 line 58-col 8 line 17].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the bidirectional communication line between client and server as taught by Ji into Marcus system in order to utilize the two selectable modes. Doing so would provide a dynamic and efficient process for using email on network.

23. As per claim 20, Marcus-Ji disclose said application programming interface provides at least one function call to said main email client by an authoring/reading component selected from the group consisting of get message, send message, save message, pass message, get registered users, enable button, disable button, and kill component as inherent feature of application program interface which provides the bi-directional communication [Ji, Fig 5A-B, col 7 line 58-col 8 line 17].

24. As per claim 21, Marcus-Ji disclose said application programming interface provides at least one function call to an authoring/reading component by said main

Art Unit: 2142

email client selected from the group consisting of close window, get component info, initialize window, send message, open message, reply message, clear message, print message as inherent feature of application program interface which provides the bi-directional communication [Ji, Fig 5A-B, col 7 line 58-col 8 line 17].

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

